Domestic Violence in Postcommunist States: Local Activism, National Policies, and Global Forces. 

This important study of the origins and evolution of activism and policies in postcommunist countries around the problem of violence against women also has the advantage of being an integrated and well-written edited volume. Katafina Fabian, the book's editor, introduces the topic in a superb introduction, contributes two essays (one of which, on Tajikistan, is coauthored with Mubarak Shariypova), and ensures conceptual and methodological coherence across the chapters. The book's focus on domestic violence as a significant public policy issue of transnational character and mobilization will be of interest to researchers of women's movements, public policymaking, and the global spread of standards and norms, as well as to scholars of feminism and of postcommunist societies.

The book comes in two parts and eleven chapters, of which the first is Fabian's introduction to the politics of domestic violence in postcommunist Europe and Eurasia. Here she lays out a framework that connects regime transition to the opening up of social and political spaces where feminist awareness, social movement activism, and domestic and international economic and political changes interact, compete, collide, or collaborate. She discusses the well-known difficulties, including the marginalization of "the woman question" in the early years of democratization, and underscores the tenacity of domestic activists and their connection with transnational actors and international organizations in the eventual acceptance of domestic violence as a social problem that needed to be addressed. What is interesting is the way that domestic nongovernmental organizations (NGOs) and women's groups "hybridized Western feminist terminology with more nationalist, maternity-focused, and community-oriented concepts" and the introduction of the concept of "economic violence" (18). Among other things, this shows that norm diffusion and implementation occur through a process of translation or vernacularization or framing/reframing. Without adaptation to local or national conditions or cultural understandings, norms emanating from elsewhere may be dismissed as culturally alien.

At the same time, there is the problem of governments signing on to international conventions on women's rights and human rights but failing to implement them. This is the topic of Olga Avdeeva's discussion of "the promises and perils of international treaties" (chapter 11), referred to also in other chapters. Governments have different reasons for signing such treaties—the imperatives of democratization and membership in the "international community"; strong ties to international organizations; the appearance of responsible statecraft. As a matter of fact, most countries have signed the United Nation's Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women (CEDAW), but many have done so with reservations; many others have signed and ratified but not implemented the provisions; and a few others, notably the United States and the Islamic Republic of Iran, have refused to ratify or sign CEDAW. This is clearly a problem for both women's rights and international law. Lack of implementation or enforcement is especially a problem when it comes to labor rights, which of course include the rights of working women. The rights to organize, to paid maternity leave of decent duration, to quality care for small children, and to a workplace free of sexual harassment—these rights are not enjoyed by working women across the globe, even if they are referred to by international organizations and in international conventions.

The volume generally posts that globalization, with its tendency toward norm diffusion and rapid interaction through the new communications technologies, creased the conditions for the discussion of domestic violence as a social problem. And yet, chapters also demonstrate the centrality of domestic politics. In her chapter on Ukraine, Alexandra Fryzuk stresses the domestic alliances and opportunities that preceded the adoption of a domestic violence law and argues that international support was secondary. (I have made a similar argument in connection with the Moroccan feminist campaign for family law.
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reform: see Valentine M. Moghadam and Elham Gheytaghi, “Political Opportunities and Strategic Choices: Comparing Feminist Campaigns in Morocco and Iran,” Mohjahdat 15, no. 3 (September 2010): 267–88. Other chapters draw attention to the innovative thinking and politically savvy strategizing of women’s rights activists. For example, the chapter on Russia by Janet Elise Johnson and Gulnara Zmailova introduces us to the notion of “economic violence”—clearly a concept drawn from local conditions and the legacy of Marxist-Leninist discourse. In the chapter on Kazakhstan, Edward Snajdor show how activists’ “pragmatic approaches” prioritizing national identity and highlighting “political expressions of belonging” (114) were critical in the domestic violence campaign, especially by the Podrugi activists, and will continue to be so as activists seek support and redress for victims. The chapter on Tajikistan is especially good at showing how activists had to confront the reification of kinship structures, Islamization, and a weak state while seeking to raise awareness of economic violence and gender injustices. In the absence of support from the state, activists turned largely to international organizations. The chapters on Poland and Slovenia show, among other things, the differences that existed even among the European communist states, as well as the differences in the evolution of domestic violence campaigns and laws in the postcommunist states. The former Yugoslavia, for example, was far more decentralized and accorded more autonomy to each of the federal states than was the case elsewhere in central and eastern Europe. Thus Slovenia, as early as 1974, adopted a law allowing for the operations of NGOs. While other postcommunist states, such as Poland, saw an explosion of NGOs after 1989, Slovenia did not, because they already existed. Even so, in both Poland and Slovenia, as well as in Hungary, membership in the European Union has proved to be a key factor in the adoption of policies targeting domestic violence. What is more, transnational feminist networks (e.g., Women against Violence in Europe, or WAVE) and international organizations (notably the Open Society Institute) are another influential factor in these and other countries’ adoption of international norms concerning gender equality and ending violence against women.

As a scholar of the Middle East and North Africa as well as of transnational feminist networks, I am struck by the book’s relevance to women’s movements and policy/legal reforms in the Middle East. Most of all, the book is impressive in its conceptual framework and attention to detail in the country case studies, which show how women’s groups navigate domestic constraints, recognize national as well as international opportunities, frame issues, and seek alliances. This is a book for scholars, policymakers, and activists alike, and I recommend it highly.

Valentine M. Moghadam
Purdue University


The Costs of justice provides an account of responses to prior-regime human rights abuses in eastern Europe. Brian K. Grodzky conducted extensive interviews in Poland, Serbia, Croatia, and Uzbekistan, examining restoration programs, as well as truth and reconciliation measures and criminal prosecutions. His account of these programs provides much useful insight. His analysis of frustration, in particular, is nuanced and highlights its limitations. His account would be more understandable, however, had he not assumed knowledge of these abuses. For example, in regard to Poland, he refers to “the abuses against protesting workers in Radom in 1970” (99) as if readers know what occurred.

Grodzky is not uniformly careful on technical detail. He portrays as widely accepted the concept of universal jurisdiction over crime—that certain offenses may be prosecuted by any country, even if the offense occurred far away. He suggests that it was “expanded” (9) by the United Nations International Law Commission (ILC) in 1996. But the ILC has no capacity to expand the law. In 2000, the issue came before the International Court of